



## Planning

5800 Shier Rings Road  
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600  
fax 614.410.4747  
[www.dublinohiousa.gov](http://www.dublinohiousa.gov)

## ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

### MEETING MINUTES

DECEMBER 16, 2015

## AGENDA

1. **BSD HC – Vitality Smoothie - Sign** **22 S. High Street**  
**15-115ARB-MPR** **Minor Project Review (Approved 5 – 0)**
2. **BSD HTN – Bridge Park West** **94-100 North High Street**  
**15-100ARB-MSP** **Master Sign Plan (Approved 5 – 0)**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, called the meeting to order at 6:29 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Board members present were: Jane Fox, Thomas Munhall, Everett Musser, and Shannon Stenberg. City representatives were: Jennifer Rauch, Katie Dodaro, and Laurie Wright.

### Administrative Business

#### Motion and Vote

Mr. Munhall moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; and Mr. Munhall. (Approved 5 – 0)

#### Motion and Vote

Mr. Munhall moved, Ms. Fox seconded, to accept the November 17, 2015, meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Musser, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

The Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Architectural Review Board [the minutes reflect the order of the published agenda.] He swore in anyone planning to address the Board on this application.

1. **BSD HC – Vitality Smoothie - Sign** **22 S. High Street**  
**15-115ARB-MPR** **Minor Project Review**

The Chair said the following application is a request for installation of a new wall sign for a new business located within an existing commercial building on the east side of South High Street, between Bridge Street and Spring Hill Lane. He said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.065(H), 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Katie Dodaro presented the site and the proposed eight-square-foot sign. She described the sign as having ½-inch, non-illuminated dimensional letters, routed from wood, flush mounted to a ½-inch wood sign panel, and the lettering is to be painted orange and green on a charcoal black background. She said the sign would be installed at a height of 12 feet and she illustrated the installation details. She said the proposed sign meets all of the Zoning Code requirements for number/type, size, location, height, and color.

Ms. Dodaro said approval is recommended for a Minor Project Review with two conditions:

- 1) That the depth of the letters be increased to one inch in thickness to provide additional dimension to the sign; and
- 2) That the applicant be provided the option to use HDU (High Density Urethane) material instead of wood for the sign panel.

David Rinaldi asked the applicant if they had a proposal from a sign company. Brian Green, 27 N. Riverview Street, Dublin, Ohio 43017, said they had a representative from Sign Com visit the site and draw-up this proposal.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if those dimensions were supposed to be the letter dimensions of 9 inches and 5¾-inches to which the applicant affirmed.

Mr. Green confirmed the sign will not be illuminated.

Jane Fox asked if there were intentions to paint the façade at a future date. Mr. Green answered the colors in the illustrations were not a good representation of the actual colors of the building and they did not plan on painting the façade.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if the ART had specific depth recommendations. Jennifer Rauch said the ART requested the sign be thicker to provide more shadow but did not specify dimensions. She deferred to the Board's judgement.

Mr. Rinaldi said his concern also comes from a durability standpoint. He wanted to know if the sign contractor was comfortable with a wood-on-wood sign.

Mr. Green said the initial sign letters would have been ½-inch thick but after Staff's review, the applicant decided one-inch depth for lettering would be appropriate. He said the proposed sign will be a pressure-treated wood panel, resistant to moisture, mildew, and rot. He said there will be multiple layers of paint as well as sealant around all the seams to ensure moisture does not seep in. He said the difference in cost between HDU and wood is several hundred dollars.

Ms. Rauch said the cost factor is why the ART left the material option up to the applicant. She said from a durability standpoint HDU might be more expensive upfront but potentially less maintenance for the applicant.

The Chair invited further comments or questions. [Hearing none.]

### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Musser moved, Mr. Rinaldi seconded, to approve a request for a Minor Project Review with two conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Munhall, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; and Mr. Musser, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

**2. BSD HTN – Bridge Park West  
15-100ARB-MSP**

**94-100 North High Street  
Master Sign Plan**

The Chair said the following application is a request for a Master Sign Plan for a new mixed-use development on the east side of North High Street, approximately 280 feet north of the intersection with North Street. He said this is a request for review and approval of a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Jennifer Rauch explained the ART reviewed the comprehensive document and it has been updated to reflect those comments. She said the ART recommended approval of the MSP on December 10<sup>th</sup> with three conditions and the applicant has already met those conditions.

Ms. Rauch said the purpose of the MSP is to allow:

- Greater degree of flexibility and creativity in sign design and display.
- The reviewing body to approve alternative requirements for sign design, number, type, size, height, location, and lighting.

Ms. Rauch indicated the applicant's proposed signs are close to the typical sizes permitted in the BSD and have added a few signs that the BSD Code did not anticipate. She said one motion and vote are required for approval of the MSP this evening. She stated this will be the applicant's "code" to follow throughout this development. She said this is the only time the ARB will see what would be permitted for this development; after the MSP is approved, the signs will go directly to sign permitting.

Ms. Rauch said the focus of the MSP is what signs and allowances are permitted for the historic mixed-use tenants including:

Corner Tenants: 3 building-mounted signs, 1 must be a projecting sign

In-Line Tenants: 2 building-mounted signs, 1 must be a projecting sign

Ms. Rauch said building-mounted signs include: wall, projecting, awning, canopy edge, and placemaking art signs and each tenant would be permitted additional sign types that include: window, sandwich board, address, and directory signs.

Jane Fox requested the definition of a placemaking art sign. Ms. Rauch read the definition from page 9 of the MSP, which states:

*"A larger projecting sign that offers the tenant more freedom with design and materiality to create a highly unique presence for their location. In turn, the design contributes to a diverse visual culture in Bridge Park. These signs may also be used to identify parking garage entrances. This sign type is permitted at a designate location in Bridge Park West as marked in building elevations. All Placemaking Art Signs shall be constructed utilizing layers, dimension, and possibly light (at the discretion of the Landlord)."*

Ms. Rauch said placemaking art signs are meant to be more visual imagery than signs.

Ms. Rauch presented a graphic to illustrate the comparison between what is permitted in the BSD and what is being requested as part of this MSP:

*Proposed Wall Signs*

BSD Permitted

Size: Maximum **8** square feet  
Height: 15 feet  
Location: Ground floor only

MSP Proposed

Size: Maximum 12 square feet in all instances except one tenant would be permitted - Maximum **20** square feet because the building is longer and it would better fit within the architecture.  
Height: 15 feet  
Location: Ground floor only

*Proposed Projecting Signs*

BSD Permitted

Size: Maximum **8** square feet  
Height: 8 feet from the bottom, 15 feet to the top  
Location: Within the first story

MSP Proposed

Size: Maximum **8** square feet  
Height: 8 feet from the bottom, 12 feet to the top – first story  
Location: First and second story

*Proposed Awning Signs*

BSD Permitted

Size: Maximum 20% of awning area, not to exceed **8** square feet  
Height: 8 feet from the bottom, 15 feet to the top  
Location: Within the first story

MSP Proposed

Size: Maximum 20% of awning area  
Height: 8 feet from the bottom, 15 feet to the top  
Location: First story only

*Proposed Canopy Edge Signs*

BSD Permitted

Size: N/A  
Location: N/A  
Design: N/A

MSP Proposed

Size: Maximum **8** square feet  
Location: First story only  
Design: Individual channel or pin-mounted letters

*Proposed Placemaking Art Signs*

BSD Permitted

Size: N/A  
Location: N/A

MSP Proposed

Size: Maximum **80** square feet  
Location: Second story only

Ms. Rauch presented the elevations noting the locations of the various signs proposed. She explained that signs might not be installed in all of the noted locations but it provides guidance as to where sign types only would be permitted on the historic mixed-use building.

David Rinaldi noted the building on the far right of the north end graphic and the building on the far left of the south end graphic did not show any signs. Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, 555 Metro Place, said that is an egress in that location.

Mr. Rinaldi requested the intent of the 30% window coverage be clarified in the MSP. Ms. Rauch added there could be graphics included on the windows.

Ms. Rauch said currently a city-wide approach to wayfinding signs is being created including the Historic District but the applicant wanted to show the Board where the signs will be located.

Mr. Munhall inquired about the south-facing walls. Ms. Rauch reported that was one of the conditions of the ART's recommendation of approval of the MSP – *That the applicant provides additional graphics for the north and south elevations of the Historic Mixed-Use buildings to provide additional sign location options for the corner tenants.* She said the applicant has complied with that condition.

Mr. Munhall said his concern is the north side is completely different than the south side. He indicated the City owns the property to the north and if that became commercial, like he envisions the south side, it would change the north side.

Mr. Starr said Mr. Munhall is correct in that today, it does not make sense to have a sign there. He said it will not be visible as it will be set back. He indicated as the property develops to the north it becomes more appropriate. He added the south side is interesting too because there is a covered patio for that tenant there and a balcony for the office space in front of it. He said he is uncertain if it is appropriate there, especially considering a future public plaza for the bridge will be in that location. He said it will take the right tenant, right sign, and right place to find a solution.

Mr. Munhall inquired about the north elevation as the roofline appeared different than he recalled. He asked if the height of the screening had been increased.

Shannon Stenberg asked about address signs. She asked if plaques would be additional or included in the two or three permitted. Mr. Starr answered the address signs would be additional. Ms. Rauch said the window signs, sandwich boards, address, and directory signs would all be additional.

Everett Musser asked if the vertical signs read both ways. Mr. Starr replied the projecting signs would be similar to the Jeni's Ice Cream sign at the corner of Bridge and High Streets.

Mr. Starr said the applicant tried to identify as many logical places for signs as possible but not all the spaces are leased yet so he may have to come back to request changes. He said the applicant considered the architecture and where the entrances will be located to see what signs make the most sense. He indicated the applicant has a signed lease for the north end, and are close to having one signed on the south end, and plan to be making those announcements soon. He emphasized one of the most important aspects in this package is the quality. He said the applicant is not going to spend this kind of money on this building and then do cheap signs. He indicated they plan to challenge the tenants to propose creative signs. He said both pedestrian and vehicular traffic had to be considered and balanced. He said the pedestrian traffic will play a big role as the plaza gets built and the pedestrian bridge comes into the fold. He said with a new building and parking behind it, we have to make sure people can find their destinations. He pointed out the applicant is going through the wayfinding process for the development on the east side as well.

Mr. Munhall inquired about the parking directional sign. Mr. Starr affirmed both the front and the back will be used for both public and private parking and added he thought most people will use the High Street entrance. He said the vehicles will be entering at the top level, will wind their way down, and come out on the bottom level.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if the graphics were for the parking as shown in this package and if the applicant planned to go forward with that or if it was just an example. Mr. Starr confirmed that graphic is what the applicant is going forward with.

Jane Fox requested confirmation that once this MSP is approved through the ARB, and a proposed sign meets the requirements, and the applicant approves it, the ARB will not review it further.

Ms. Rauch confirmed this would be the case. She said Staff and the applicant have discussed the sign review process and it has been made clear the types of graphics the city and the applicant want to see here. She said this is important for the Board to ensure the MSP includes the requirements and standards desired during this review. She said we need to ensure the MSP meets the context of the Historic District and fits within the overall vision for the Bridge Street District.

Ms. Fox asked if the kiosk design shown in the rendering would be the same for every district in the City. Mr. Starr confirmed this is part of the overall city-wide wayfinding project.

Ms. Fox said the kiosks look very contemporary. Ms. Rauch said the design of the kiosks is set because the intent is to ensure the kiosks are consistent throughout the District.

Mr. Munhall asked if there were other kiosks in the Historic District now. Ms. Rauch answered not currently.

Joell Angel Chumbly, Kolar Design, 807 Broadway, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202, said they are working with the City on multiple projects, including the work with Crawford Hoving Development Partners. She explained the parking system is going to be a city-wide system for all parking garages, especially those that are part of the Bridge Park projects, east and west. She said the aesthetics were built off a whole comprehensive wayfinding plan for the City that includes vehicular wayfinding that guides visitors to the garages and the garages that are part of this development support that public parking system. She said this needs to be consistent throughout the City. She said they have already gone through approval with City Council and are working on getting the first phase implemented as part of the Riverside Drive project.

Ms. Fox said it is one thing to say the applicant is given variances on windows, and variances on size of wall mounted signs. She said she is concerned how the size and number of signs all play together in context. She pointed out this is the first time we have processed a MSP in the Historic District.

Ms. Fox asked for clarification on the third condition.

Ms. Rauch explained the timeline review process noted in the MSP was not correct and Staff asked the applicant to update the timeline to reflect that. Should this MSP be approved, she said the applicant would go straight to sign permitting. She added if the applicant has a tenant that wants something completely different than what was approved, the applicant has to bring the entire MSP back to the ARB to request changes. She said the MSP acts as the requirements for the signs within this development and if a tenant wants to change the requirements, then the ARB has to review that request comprehensively and determine how it impacts the whole development. She indicated that is not the desire of Crawford Hoving nor is it the desire of Staff because this will have been approved.

Mr. Starr pointed out Crawford Hoying has strict language in their leases regarding signs and this MSP is an attachment to the leases as an exhibit and the tenants will receive this information. He said he has been sending this to prospective tenants because this is one of the first questions we hear from tenants: 1) What is the rent; and 2) What is permitted for signage. He indicated the MSP places importance on using quality materials.

Ms. Fox requested confirmation that the applicant will be reviewing what the tenant proposes. Mr. Starr explained he is the Director of Development and his primary role is working with all the tenants so he has been involved with all of these negotiations. He said they are all receiving this well, even as it has been continually updated.

Ms. Fox said her biggest concern is that once the MSP is approved by the ARB, that the ARB will never see the actual signs proposed. Ms. Rauch confirmed that is correct and meets the Code. Ms. Fox said her questions are due to the ARB never having been through this process. She asked for what has already been determined on the east side of the river.

Ms. Rauch said a MSP has been approved for a development on the east side (Tuller Flats) but it is a residential development and not a multiple tenant project.

Mr. Musser asked Ms. Fox if she is suggesting she would like to see signs individually. Ms. Fox replied she did not want to necessarily see each sign individually but maybe she had a misunderstanding of how the MSP process would work. She said she can understand and appreciate that process given the amount of signs that will be proposed from many tenants.

Mr. Starr said this is important to tenants and they want certainty and to understand what they would be permitted with the MSP. He indicated he might be placed in a position where a lease is conditioned upon receiving a specific sign approval and that is not where he wants to be; he will want to get those deals completed. He said he thought the ARB would be excited about the deals he is working on.

Ms. Rauch emphasized from a Code perspective, the intent for BSD overall is to provide consistency and make it known what is permitted up front.

Shannon Stenberg inquired about the durability of signs. She asked if there was any provision for future review. She gave an example of 10, 15, or 20 years down the road, that sign may no longer be in style. She asked if there was a review process for tenants to update signs.

Mr. Starr explained one of the lease provisions is a 'refresh of the sign' every three years that the tenant would pay for and try to negotiate every five years. He said the reality is these tenants will probably turn over every ten years and they could replace the sign at that time. He noted awnings are a perfect example of something that looks 'tired'. He pointed out the west exposure areas and how sunlight can affect the awnings. He said that is one example of what the applicant will want to remain appearing sharp.

The Chair asked if there were any questions or concerns regarding general placement as that is the main part being reviewed here.

Mr. Rinaldi said where the applicant has noted signs are allowable are appropriate to him.

Mr. Musser indicated this is going to be a quality project and we have to have some faith in the fact that the applicant is going to provide quality signs and they are going to be reviewed. He stated this MSP is appropriate in this case.

Mr. Rinaldi said there is a certain amount of faith in the MSP. He indicated he has impressed with the quality for everything the applicant has brought forward to the Board in terms of design of this project and assumes that is what the applicant will carry through for the signs.

Ms. Fox said she likes the specifics and graphics noted in the MSP. She said she feels much more comfortable knowing that a particular sign is going to have certain qualities, which is really helpful for future Boards reviewing the MSP.

The Chair asked the window pane versus a window to be clarified as a condition in the Board Order. Mr. Starr confirmed the whole window is what the applicant was envisioning.

Mr. Starr asked Ms. Rauch to clarify the wording for the building mounted sign provision so it is clearly differentiated between the ground floor tenant and the second story tenant requirements.

Ms. Rauch said approval is recommended for a Master Sign Plan with five conditions:

- 1) That the general regulations matrix outlining the sign types and allowance should be updated to clarify the building mounted sign types from the other sign types;
- 2) That the applicant provides additional graphics for the north and south elevations of the Historic Mixed-Use buildings to provide additional sign location options for the corner tenants;
- 3) That the MSP includes a zoning review timeline graphic, which will need to be revised to accurately reflect the review and permit process following the approval of the MSP;
- 4) That the document be revised to clarify the window sign allowances that include the entire window area and not individual window panes; and
- 5) That the second floor tenants are permitted only a single projecting sign.

Mr. Starr agreed to the conditions as written.

### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Rinaldi moved, Ms. Fox seconded, to approve a request for a Master Sign Plan with five conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Munhall, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

### **Communications**

Jennifer Rauch said the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* are still being worked on - it is her goal to finish this at the beginning of the year. Ms. Fox requested plenty of time to review the material.

Jane Fox inquired about completing a historic inventory. Ms. Rauch said the City has completed a "Request for Qualifications" for consultants and there have been four submissions under review. She said the proposal includes conducting the inventory; reviewing OHI forms; identifying additional cultural and landscape pieces in the City that are historic; and providing resources and documentation on how the ARB can better support applicants.

Ms. Fox said we have talked frequently about cultural and historic landscape pieces and asked if there has been conversations between Planning and Engineering. Ms. Rauch answered not at this point but as part of this discussion on how we want to engage consultants and the types of things we want them to look at would include our continued concern about the stone walls. She said we will address this more

holistically. Ms. Fox indicated timeliness was needed for some of this because so much is happening right now. Ms. Rauch reported the new Planning Director has been brought up-to-date on all of this.

David Rinaldi inquired about the pedestrian bridge. Ms. Rauch said the project is moving forward.

Tom Munhall asked if there were updates to the extension of John Shields Parkway. Ms. Rauch said the east side is not programmed into the CIP in the next five years but that could change as priorities shift.

Ms. Rauch suggested inviting Mandy Bishop to present to a future ARB meeting to discuss the public transportation projects.

Ms. Rauch said there is an on-going discussion about the BSD and the park system.

Mr. Munhall asked if a park initiative in the Historic District would be reviewed by the ARB. Ms. Rauch indicated the CIP projects would not come through the ARB.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:37 pm.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on January 27, 2016.